

1 **QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP**

2 Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)  
dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com  
3 Sara Jenkins (CA Bar No. 230097)  
sarajenkins@quinnemanuel.com  
4 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
5 Telephone: (650) 801-5000  
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

6 Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com  
7 Teuta Fani (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
teutafani@quinnemanuel.com  
Joseph H. Margolies (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
josephmargolies@quinnemanuel.com  
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Telephone: (312) 705-7400  
Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

8 Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)  
stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com  
9 Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)  
violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com  
10 Crystal Nix-Hines (CA Bar No. 326971)  
crystalnixhines@quinnemanuel.com  
11 Alyssa G. Olson (CA Bar No. 305705)  
alyolson@quinnemanuel.com  
12 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
13 Telephone: (213) 443-3000  
Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

14 Josef Ansorge (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com  
15 Xi (“Tracy”) Gao (CA Bar No. 326266)  
tracygao@quinnemanuel.com  
Carl Spilly (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
carlspilly@quinnemanuel.com  
1300 I Street NW, Suite 900  
16 Washington D.C., 20005  
Telephone: (202) 538-8000  
Facsimile: (202) 538-8100

17 Jomaire Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com  
18 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor  
New York, NY 10010  
Telephone: (212) 849-7000  
Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

19 Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)  
jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com  
20 50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

21 *Counsel for Defendant Google LLC*

22 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
23 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, OAKLAND DIVISION**

24 CHASOM BROWN, *et al.*, individually and  
25 on behalf of themselves and all others  
similarly situated,

26 Plaintiffs,

27 v.

28 GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

**DECLARATION OF ALYSSA G. OLSON  
IN SUPPORT OF ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO SEAL PORTIONS OF  
PLAINTIFFS’ OPPOSITION TO  
GOOGLE’S MOTION TO STRIKE**

Judge: Hon. Susan van Keulen, USMJ

1 I, Alyssa G. Olson, declare as follows:

2 1. I am a member of the bar of the State of California and an attorney at Quinn Emanuel  
 3 Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, attorneys for Defendant Google LLC (“Google”) in this action. I make  
 4 this declaration of my own personal, firsthand knowledge, and if called and sworn as a witness, I  
 5 could and would testify competently thereto.

6 2. I am making this declaration pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(e)-(f) as an attorney  
 7 for Google as the Designating Party, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(f)(3) in response to Dkt.  
 8 744.

9 3. On September 14, 2022, Plaintiffs filed their Administrative Motion to Consider  
 10 Whether Google’s Materials Should Be Sealed regarding Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Google’s Motion  
 11 to Strike. On September 14, 2022, I received an unredacted service copy of these documents.

12 4. The common law right of public access to judicial proceedings is not a constitutional  
 13 right and it is “not absolute.” *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978); *Crowe v.*  
 14 *Cty. of San Diego*, 210 F. Supp. 2d 1189, 1194 (S.D. Cal. 2002) (“[T]here is no right of access which  
 15 attaches to all judicial proceedings.” (internal citations omitted)). The right is weakest where, as  
 16 here, the proceedings concern a non-dispositive discovery motion; rather than satisfy the more  
 17 stringent “compelling reasons” standard, a party seeking to seal materials in these circumstances  
 18 must make only a “particularized showing” of “good cause.” *Kamakana v. City & County of*  
 19 *Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178–80 (9th Cir. 2006). Such sealing is appropriate when the information  
 20 at issue constitutes “competitively sensitive information,” such as “confidential research,  
 21 development, or commercial information.” *France Telecom S.A. v. Marvell Semiconductor Inc.*,  
 22 2014 WL 4965995, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2014); *see also Phillips v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d  
 23 1206, 1211 (9th Cir. 2002) (acknowledging courts’ “broad latitude” to “prevent disclosure of  
 24 materials for many types of information, including, but not limited to, trade secrets or other  
 25 confidential research, development, or commercial information”); *Standard & Poor’s Corp. Inc. v.*  
 26 *Commodity Exch., Inc.*, 541 F. Supp. 1273, 1275 (S.D.N.Y. 1982) (“[T]he overriding interest to be  
 27 found in business confidences . . . require[s] . . . temporary reasonably restricted access to the  
 28 Courtroom of members of the public.”).

1           5. I have reviewed the documents that Plaintiffs seek to file under seal pursuant to Civil  
 2 Local Rule 79-5(f). Based on my review, there is good cause to seal the following information:

Document(s) to be Sealed	Basis for Sealing
Plaintiffs' Opposition to Google's Motion to Strike  Page 16:27	The information requested to be sealed contains Google's highly confidential and proprietary information regarding highly sensitive features of Google's internal systems and operations, including internal metrics, that Google maintains as confidential in the ordinary course of its business and is not generally known to the public or Google's competitors. Such confidential and proprietary information reveals Google's internal strategies, system designs, and business practices for operating and maintaining many of its important services, and falls within the protected scope of the Protective Order entered in this action. <i>See</i> Dkt. 81 at 2-3. Public disclosure of such confidential and proprietary information could affect Google's competitive standing as competitors may alter their systems and practices relating to competing products. It may also place Google at an increased risk of cybersecurity threats, as third parties may seek to use the information to compromise Google's internal practices relating to competing products.
Exhibit 1 to Mao Declaration - Google Privilege Log 004  Pages 1-4, "Title" column	The information requested to be sealed contains Google's highly confidential and proprietary information regarding highly sensitive features of Google's internal systems and operations, including various types of Google's internal projects, project code names, data signals, and logs, and their proprietary functionalities, that Google maintains as confidential in the ordinary course of its business and is not generally known to the public or Google's competitors. Such confidential and proprietary information reveals Google's internal strategies, system designs, and business practices for operating and maintaining many of its important services, and falls within the protected scope of the Protective Order entered in this action. <i>See</i> Dkt. 81 at 2-3. Public disclosure of such confidential and proprietary information could affect Google's competitive standing as competitors may alter their systems and practices relating to competing products. It may also place Google at an increased risk of cybersecurity threats, as third parties may seek to use the information to compromise Google's internal practices relating to competing products.

27           6. Google's request is narrowly tailored in order to protect its confidential information.  
 28 These redactions are limited in scope and volume. Because the proposed redactions are narrowly

1 tailored and limited to portions containing Google's highly-confidential or confidential information,  
2 Google requests that the portions of the aforementioned documents be redacted from any public  
3 version of those documents.

4 7. Google does not seek to redact or file under seal any of the remaining portions of  
5 documents not indicated in the table above.

6 I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true  
7 and correct. Executed in Culver City, California on September 21, 2022.

9 By /s/ Alyssa G. Olson  
10 Alyssa G. Olson  
Attorney for Defendant